arXiv:1409.2401v1 [physics.chem-ph] 8 Sep 2014

Studies on the bound-state spectrum of hyperbolic potential

Amlan K. Roy*

Division of Chemical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER)-Kolkata, Mohanpur Campus, P. O. BCKV Campus Main Office, Nadia, 741252, WB, India.

Abstract

Bound states of hyperbolic potential is investigated by means of a generalized pseudospectral method. Significantly improved eigenvalues, eigenfunctions are obtained efficiently for arbitrary n, ℓ quantum states by solving the relevant non-relativistic Schrödinger equation allowing a non-uniform, optimal spatial discretization. Eigenvalues accurate up to tenth decimal place are reported for a large range of potential parameters; thus covering a wide range of interaction. Excellent agreement with available literature results is observed in all occasions. Special attention is paid for higher states. Some new states are given. Energy variations with respect to parameters in the potential are studied in considerable detail for the first time.

Keywords: Hyperbolic potential, generalized pseudospectral method, ro-vibrational level, rotational state.

*Email: akroy@iiserkol.ac.in, akroy6k@gmail.com.

This article is dedicated to my kind-hearted mother Ms. Radha Rani Roy, on the occasion of her 65th birthday. It is because of her untiring effort and constant inspiration that I could pursue research.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ever since the inception of empirical Morse potential about 85 years ago, a vast number of potential functions have been reported for molecules, with varying degrees of flexibility and accuracy. While much improvements and modifications of the original exponential potential is made, the construction of a universal energy-distance relationship for molecules still remains elusive. Thus there is significant interest and development to mimic the real molecular situations, as evidenced from a large number of publications in recent years. Generally, the more the number of parameters in analytic potential energy function, the better it fits with experimental data. The literature is vast; some representative recent works include, for example [1–7] and the references therein.

In this work, we are interested in a three-parameter exponential potential for diatomic molecules, named hyperbolic (empirical) potential, suggested in 1986, by Schiöberg [8],

$$v(r) = D_e[1 - \sigma_0 \coth(\alpha r)]^2, \qquad \sigma_0 < 1, \tag{1}$$

where D_e, σ_0, α are three positive adjustable parameters representing the properties of interaction potential. The potential function has a minimum value zero at a point $r = r_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha} \operatorname{arctanh} \sigma_0$, where r_0 denotes equilibrium distance (bond length) between the nuclei. It approaches infinity at the point $r = 0$, and goes to D_e exponentially for large r. Also its relation to Morse, Kratzer, Coulomb, harmonic oscillator and other potential functions has been discussed [8]. Further it is suggested that this potential may fit the experimental Rydberg-Klein-Rees curve more closely than the Morse function. Some other interesting aspects of this potential can be found in the references [8, 9].

Like many other potentials of physical interest, while the Schrödinger equation with hyperbolic potential can be solved for s waves, *exact* solutions has not yet been obtained so far for $\ell \neq 0$ states, due to the centrifugal term. Thus approximations are necessary for a general eigenstate with arbitrary quantum numbers n, ℓ. Several attempts have made before, some of which are mentioned now. Approximate solution of Schrödinger equation of diatomic molecules with this potential has been obtained using hypergeometric series method [9]. Rigorous solutions for $\ell = 0$ case have been provided, where the eigenfunctions are expressed in terms of Jacobi polynomials [9]. Later, arbitrary ℓ-state solutions are constructed in [10] by a proper approximation of the centrifugal term offering normalized functions in terms of generalized hypergeometric functions ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$. Arbitrary

ℓ-wave solutions have also been suggested by an approximation [11] to the centrifugal term as $\frac{1}{r^2} \approx \frac{4\alpha^2 e^{-2\alpha r}}{(1-e^{-2\alpha r})^2}$. Good-quality eigenvalues and eigenfunctions for general quantum numbers n, ℓ were presented by employing a Nikiforov-Uvarov approach [12–14], such that the approximate energy spectra and normalized total wave functions are represented in closed form through hypergeometric functions or Jacobi polynomials. In another development [15], general eigensolutions are provided by means of an asymptotic iteration method in conjunction with a proper approximation to the centrifugal term. Very recently, non-relativistic ℓ-state solutions of N-dimensional Schrödinger equation with hyperbolic potential has been offered [16] in hyperspherical coordinates within the asymptotic iteration method along with an approximation to the centrifugal term along the lines of [11]. Relativistic bound-state solutions are also discussed by solving the Dirac equation with an aid of supersymmetric quantum mechanics and functional analysis method [17]. Furthermore, it has been argued recently [18] that the three empirical molecular potentials, *viz.,* Manning-Rosen, Schlöberg and Deng-Fan potentials perform rather closely to the celebrated Morse potential. This was numerically done in terms of two spectroscopic parameters, namely, vibrational rotational coupling parameter α_e and anharmonicity parameter $\omega_e\chi_e$ for a set of 16 selected diatomic molecules.

The purpose of this work is to make a systematic investigation on the bound-state spectra of hyperbolic potential through accurate eigenvalues, eigenfunction and other properties. It is worth mentioning here that for some of the other molecular potentials like Morse, Kratzer, pseudoharmonic or Manning-Rosen, etc., a decent number of theoretical attempts have been published. Thus very good-quality results are available. However for the potential under consideration, relatively much less effort has been made. In this study, we employ the generalized pseudospectral (GPS) method, found to offer promising results for a number of physical situations (see, for example, [19–26] and references therein) in recent years. This is a simple, efficient and yet accurate method which relies on an optimal, spatial discretization of the radial Schrödinger equation. The usefulness and validity of our proposed scheme is demonstrated through quite accurate ro-vibrational energies of *both low and high-lying* states covering weak, intermediate and strong interaction in the potential. Thus at first we report the energies of *both* s-wave and rotational states for different α and σ_0 values. Then a detailed analysis of energy variation with respect to the parameters α, σ_0, D_e is presented, which, to our knowledge, has not been attempted before. A thorough comparison

with literature results is made whenever possible. Section II gives a brief summary of the employed method, while Section IV discusses the results. Finally a few concluding remarks are made in Section V.

II. THE GPS METHOD

Since this has been already discussed earlier [19–26], it suffices here to give only a review. The desired radial Schrödinger equation in a non-relativistic case can be written as,

$$\hat{H}(r)\ \phi(r) = \varepsilon\ \phi(r). \tag{2}$$

The Hamiltonian operator includes usual kinetic and potential energy terms (symbols have their usual meanings),

$$\hat{H}(r) = -\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + v_{\rm eff}(r), \quad v_{\rm eff}(r) = v(r) + \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2r^2} \tag{3}$$

and $v(r)$ is given in Eq. (1). The principal feature of this scheme lies in approximating a function $f(x)$ defined in the interval $x \in [-1, 1]$ by a polynomial $f_N(x)$ of order N

$$f(x) \cong f_N(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} f(x_j)\ g_j(x), \tag{4}$$

such that the approximation is *exact* at the *collocation points* x_j, i.e., $f_N(x_j) = f(x_j)$. In what follows we employ the Legendre pseudospectral method using $x_0 = -1$, $x_N = 1$, where $x_j (j = 1, \ldots, N-1)$ are obtainable from the roots of first derivatives of Legendre polynomial, $P_N(x)$ with respect to x, i.e., $P'_N(x_j) = 0$. $g_j(x)$ in Eq. (4), called cardinal functions, are given by the following expression,

$$g_j(x) = -\frac{1}{N(N+1)P_N(x_j)}\ \ \frac{(1-x^2)\ P'_N(x)}{x - x_j}. \tag{5}$$

They have the unique property $g_j(x_{j'}) = \delta_{j'j}$. Now the semi-infinite domain $r \in [0, \infty]$ is mapped onto a finite domain $x \in [-1, 1]$ by a transformation $r = r(x)$. Then one can make use of the following algebraic nonlinear mapping, $r = r(x) = L\ \ \frac{1+x}{1-x+\alpha}$, where L and $\alpha = 2L/r_{max}$ may be termed as the mapping parameters. Furthermore, introducing a symmetrization procedure, eventually leads to the following transformed Hamiltonian,

$$\hat{H}(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\ \frac{1}{r'(x)}\ \frac{d^2}{dx^2}\ \frac{1}{r'(x)} + v(r(x)) + v_m(x), \qquad v_m(x) = \frac{3(r'')^2 - 2r'''r'}{8(r')^4}. \tag{6}$$

The advantage is that this leads to a *symmetric* matrix eigenvalue problem which can be readily solved to give accurate eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. Many other features of the method can be found in the references mentioned above.

A series of test calculations were done for a number of potential parameters in the literature to optimize its performance with respect to the mapping parameters. In this way, the following parameter set ($r_{max}=500, \alpha=25, N=300$) has been consistently used throughout this work, which seemed to be quite satisfactory for the purpose at hand. It has been found that, for lower states, smaller values of r_{max} is often sufficient. However for higher states, this needs to be increased presumably to incorporate the complicated long-range tail in the wave function. In previous studies with GPS method, such as for Hulthén and Yukawa potentials in [20], similar phenomenon was observed, where for *higher* excitations and for *stronger* screening parameters, maximum values of r were increased in order to obtain eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of comparable high accuracy as in the present study. Thus one can obtain decent accuracy with relatively smaller r; however, if the desired accuracy is high, then usually higher values of radial distance is necessary. Recently, a similar situation has been encountered in the study of bound states of Manning-Rosen potential within a J-matrix approach as well [27]. However, it is worthwhile noting here that the accuracy in the GPS method is apparently not affected by the total *number of grid points*, as long as a reasonably decent number of collocation points are used for sampling the radial mesh. Thus changing the maximum r has no bearing on the computational effort, which is dictated by the dimension of Hamiltonian matrix, i.e., the number of grid points.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

At first, our GPS eigenvalues (in a.u.) of hyperbolic potential having angular quantum number $\ell = 0 - 5$ are presented for some low and high vibrational levels. Tables 1, 2 report such energies for $\sigma_0 = 0.1$, 0.2 respectively for both small (short range) as well as large (long range) α values, for a fixed $D_e = 10$ in both cases. As mentioned earlier, the analytical expression for eigenvalues, eigenfunctions for $\ell = 0$ states are given in [9, 10]. Here, we provide the numerical values for some representative states through the current GPS scheme, for sake of completeness and assessing approximate theoretical methods in future. No results are yet available for $l = 5$ states; these are reported here for the first

TABLE I: Comparison of the calculated eigenvalues (in a.u.) of hyperbolic potential for some selected states, with $D_e = 10$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.1$. PR signifies Present Result. See text for details.

State	α	Energy		α	Energy	
		PR	Literature		PR	Literature
$1s$	0.05	1.0454567586		0.1	1.9750000000[†]	
	0.15	2.7988075454		0.2	3.5267499380	
	0.25	4.1682605827		0.3	4.7322309905	
$2s$	0.05	2.6489764589		0.1	4.3644444444[†]	
	0.15	5.5249158695		0.2	6.3339868537	
	0.25	6.9089129102		0.3	7.3209901372	
$2p$	0.05	1.2498051847		0.1	2.6188810876[†]	2.61556[a],2.61874[b],2.61886[c],2.61935[d]
	0.15	3.9057399878	3.8983[a],3.90544[b],3.90571[c],3.90645[d]	0.2	5.0037812585	4.99062[a],5.00331[b],5.00379[c],5.00457[d]
	0.25	5.8865089432	5.86611[a],5.88594[b],5.88669[c],5.88725[d]	0.3	6.5710530358	
$3s$	0.05	3.8425598233		0.1	5.7733673469[†]	
	0.15	6.8428380841		0.2	7.4628330847	
	0.25	7.8212976304		0.3	8.0137358269	
$3p$	0.05	2.7996362716		0.1	4.7355222463[†]	4.73223[a],4.73540[b],4.73552[c],4.73638[d]
	0.15	6.0455923499	6.03829[a],6.04543[b],6.04570[c],6.04649[d]	0.2	6.9165993412	6.90394[a],6.91663[b],6.91711[c],6.91733[d]
	0.25	7.4830625708	7.46417[a],7.48400[b],7.48475[c],7.48358[d]	0.3	7.8362759610	
$3d$	0.05	1.6309013969		0.1	3.6274020405	3.61747[a],3.62699[b],3.62734[c],3.62769[d]
	0.15	5.2948288570	5.27263[a],5.29404[b],5.29485[c],5.2951[d]	0.2	6.4757876581	6.43684[a],6.47492[b],6.47635[c],6.47598[d]
	0.25	7.2550414560	7.19574[a],7.25516[d]	0.3	7.7474942818	
$4s$	0.05	4.7516054891		0.1	6.6549999999[†]	
	0.15	7.5322784969		0.2	7.9384186119	
$4p$	0.05	3.9564953219		0.1	6.0029405462[†]	5.99969[a],6.00287[b],6.00299[c],6.0039[d]
	0.15	7.1151441415	7.10812[a],7.11526[b],7.11553[c],7.11589[d]	0.2	7.7178104204	7.70634[a],7.71903[b],7.71951[c],7.71826[d]
$4d$	0.05	3.0818932921		0.1	5.3316081211	5.32177[a],5.33129[b],5.33164[c],5.33216[d]
	0.15	6.7360244502	6.71441[a],6.73583[b],6.73663[c],6.73642[d]	0.2	7.5431001876	7.50672[a],7.54480[b],7.54623[c],7.54331[d]
$4f$	0.05	2.1422543827		0.1	4.6904242338	4.67061[a],4.68965[b],4.69036[c],4.69058[d]
	0.15	6.4310230099	6.38708[a],6.42992[b],6.43153[c],6.43112[d]	0.2	7.4332936425	7.35782[a],7.43397[b],7.43683[c],7.43334[d]
$5s$	0.1	7.2258641975[†]		0.2	8.0934772157	
$5p$	0.1	6.8034458362[†]	6.80027[a],6.80345[b],6.80357[c],6.80432[d]	0.2	8.0379547447	8.02919[a],8.03813[d]
$5d$	0.1	6.3777790319	6.3681[a],6.37762[b],6.37798[c],6.37842[d]	0.2	7.9859391139	7.95561[a],7.98606[d]
$5f$	0.1	5.9811548812	5.96159[a],5.98063[b],5.98134[c],5.98147[d]	0.2	7.9619825982	7.89634[a],7.96203[b]
$5g$	0.1	5.6291843445	5.59631[a],5.62805[b],5.62924[c],5.62926[d]	0.2	7.9681883484	7.8515[a],7.9682[b]
$6s$	0.05	6.0116914952		0.1	7.5999999999[†]	
$6p$	0.05	5.5257326177		0.1	7.3240501180[†]	7.32099[a],7.32416[b],7.32428[c],7.32476[d]
$6d$	0.05	5.0053978196		0.1	7.0481354433	7.03872[a],7.04824[b],7.04859[c],7.04873[d]
$6f$	0.05	4.4619148584		0.1	6.7949021656	6.77575[a],6.79479[b],6.79550[c],6.79528[d]
$6g$	0.05	3.9065692045		0.1	6.5743566106	6.54204[a],6.57377[b],6.57496[c],6.57452[d]
$6h$	0.05	3.3496137229		0.1	6.3881065784	

[a]Ref. [10]. [b]Ref. [12]. [c]Ref. [15]. [d]Ref. [28], as quoted in [10].

[†]Numerical calculation by the anonymous referee completely reproduces these energies.

TABLE II: Comparison of the calculated eigenvalues (in a.u.) of hyperbolic potential for some selected states, with $D_e = 10$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.2$. PR signifies Present Result. See text for details.

State	α	Energy		α	Energy	
		PR	Literature		PR	Literature
$1s$	0.05	0.5206159050		0.1	1.0099883720	
	0.15	1.4693690763		0.2	1.9000000000	
	0.25	2.3031087802		0.3	2.6799042864	
$2s$	0.05	1.4233497848		0.1	2.5388212990	
	0.15	3.4214960600		0.2	4.1244444444	
	0.25	4.6860146130		0.3	5.1344560926	
$2p$	0.05	0.5759729144		0.1	1.2088815437	1.20559[a],1.20876[b],1.20888[c],1.20903[d]
	0.15	1.8666012343	1.85922[a],1.86636[b],1.86663[c],1.86689[d]	0.2	2.5203736065	2.50731[a],2.52000[b],2.52048[c],2.5208[d]
	0.25	3.1471214590	3.12683[a],3.14666[b],3.14740[c],3.14766[d]	0.3	3.7302842235	
$3s$	0.05	2.1873069608		0.1	3.6502178901	
	0.15	4.6502615096		0.2	5.3383673469	
	0.25	5.8065203909		0.3	6.1133217893	
$3p$	0.05	1.4701906465		0.1	2.6831615461	2.6799[a],2.68308[b],2.68320[c],2.68358[d]
	0.15	3.6713683033	3.66413[a],3.67127[b],3.67154[c],3.67198[d]	0.2	4.4650859376	4.45247[a],4.46516[b],4.46564[c],4.46579[d]
	0.25	5.0916526920	5.07247[a],5.09231[b],5.09305[c],5.09235[d]	0.3	5.5749958113	
$3d$	0.05	0.6846288856		0.1	1.5790711085	1.56921[a],1.57873[b],1.57908[c],1.5792[d]
	0.15	2.5483797803	2.52631[a],2.54773[b],2.54853[c],2.54859[d]	0.2	3.4820289250	3.44311[a],3.48119[b],3.48262[c],3.48228[d]
	0.25	4.3116040028	4.25156[a],4.31185[d]	0.3	5.0067467188	
$4s$	0.05	2.8373593986		0.1	4.4695767827	
	0.15	5.4349868378		0.2	5.9949999999	
$4p$	0.05	2.2271911909		0.1	3.7569554439	3.75375[a],3.75692[b],3.75704[c],3.75758[d]
	0.15	4.8120058045	4.80501[a],4.81215[b],4.81242[c],4.81274[d]	0.2	5.5302072359	5.51842[a],5.53111[b],5.53159[c],5.53807[d]
$4d$	0.05	1.5621837561		0.1	2.9528062837	2.94305[a],2.95257[b],2.95293[c],2.95317[d]
	0.15	4.1042488047	4.08268[a],4.10410[b],4.10491[c],4.1047[d]	0.2	5.0009436574	4.96371[a],5.00179[b],5.00322[c],5.00137[d]
$4f$	0.05	0.8426504320		0.1	2.0740692799	2.05438[a],2.07342[b],2.07413[c],2.07417[d]
	0.15	3.3572824896	3.31338[a],3.35622[b],3.35783[c],3.35742[d]	0.2	4.4747398160	4.39793[a],4.47408[b],4.47694[c],4.47486[d]
$5s$	0.1	5.0775188943		0.2	6.3108641975	
$5p$	0.1	4.5494225580	4.54628[a],4.54946[b],4.54958[c],4.55015[d]	0.2	6.0977741801	6.08749[a],6.09822[d]
$5d$	0.1	3.9568482193	3.94725[a],3.95677[b],3.95713[c],3.9574[d]	0.2	5.8304426454	5.79634[a],5.83083[d]
$5f$	0.1	3.3153750988	3.29593[a],3.31497[b],3.31568[c],3.31567[d]	0.2	5.5607458025	5.48854[a],5.56096[d]
$5g$	0.1	2.6411615196	2.60844[a],2.64017[b],2.64136[c],2.64124[d]	0.2	5.3187638283	5.19365[a],5.31882[d]
$6s$	0.05	3.8694697469		0.1	5.5277892423	
$6p$	0.05	3.4223025374		0.1	5.1375029556	5.13446[a],5.13763[b],5.13775[c],5.13824[d]
$6d$	0.05	2.9386083805		0.1	4.6991510082	4.68977[a],4.69929[b],4.69965[c],4.69979[d]
$6f$	0.05	2.4197313136		0.1	4.2266063298	4.20751[a],4.22654[b],4.22726[c],4.22706[d]
$6g$	0.05	1.8674233592		0.1	3.7335511103	3.70128[a],3.73301[b],3.73421[c],3.73378[d]
$6h$	0.05	1.2837958703		0.1	3.2323320970	

[a]Ref. [10]. [b]Ref. [12]. [c]Ref. [15]. [d]Ref. [28], as quoted in [10].

time. First systematic and definitive results for arbitrary (n, ℓ) states were published in [10]. Present calculated ro-vibrational energies seem to agree with those of [10] in the *short* range (small α) more than that in the *long* range (large α). Similar considerations also hold good as radial as well as angular quantum numbers *increase*. With an improved approximation to the centrifugal term as below (c_0 is a proper shift found by the expansion procedure),

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \approx 4\alpha^2 \left[c_0 + \frac{e^{-2\alpha r}}{1-e^{-2\alpha r}} + \left(\frac{e^{-2\alpha r}}{1-e^{-2\alpha r}} \right)^2 \right], \tag{7}$$

somehow better eigenvalues, wave functions have been obtained in [12], within the Nikiforov-Uvarov formalism. The current energies show very good agreement with these, especially in the *long* range as well for *higher* excitations. The recent asymptotic iteration results [15] employing a very similar expansion for the centrifugal term, generally produces eigenvalues similar in quality with that of [12] in majority occasions, but occasionally showing slight improvements in other cases. Wherever possible, numerically calculated eigenvalues [28] generated from the MATHEMATICA suite of computer program, as reported in [10], are also quoted for easy comparison. These are also in general agreement with other reference energies. We are able to present energies accurate up to the tenth place of decimal, for which there appears to be no reference available for direct comparison.

Now we proceed for changes in energy with respect to potential parameters. Figure 1 depicts such variations for np $(n = 2-7)$ states in the left panel in (a), for $D_e = 10, \sigma_0 = 0.1$ for a considerably broad range of α. It is noticed that, for a given ℓ series, energies steadily increase and then attend a maximum constant value as *alpha* reaches a particular value. The initial increase becomes progressively sharper for higher n. For higher n, apparently this maximum in energy is attained for smaller α and vice versa. For other ℓ series (with varying n), similar trend is observed and not produced here to save space. In (b) now, the energy change with α is shown for 2p state, at seven values of σ_0, *viz.*, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6 and 0.8 respectively, keeping D_e fixed at 10 again. The threshold α value, after which energy becomes constant, is gradually shifted to higher values as σ_0 is increased. A similar trend has been observed for other states as well, which are not repeated.

In Fig. 2, energy variations are considered with respect to σ_0, for a constant value of $D_e = 10$. The left panel (a) displays this for np $(n = 2-7)$ states, having $\alpha = 0.1$. For all of them, at first energy sharply falls from an initial fixed value and then starts to decrease at a slower rate after some particular σ_0, resembling much like an exponential decay. For a given



FIG. 1: Energy eigenvalues (a.u.) of hyperbolic potential as function of α. The left panel (a) corresponds to np ($n = 2 - 7$) states, having $D_e = 10, \sigma_0 = 0.1$, while (b) shows the same for 2p state for a fixed $D_e = 10$, and $\sigma_0 = 0.1, 0.2, 0, 3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6,\ 0.8$ respectively.

ℓ quantum number, the initial fall-off is much stronger for lower n, and its extent gradually diminishes for higher values of n, so much so that for 10p (not shown in the figure), it very much looks like a linear decay. For other ℓ series of the hyperbolic potential, very similar trend is followed and thus omitted. The right panel (b) now shows how energy changes with σ_0, for a state, for seven values of $\alpha = 0.1,\ 0.2,\ \cdots,\ 0.7$, taking 2p as a representative. For progressively higher values of α, the separation between two successive curves tends to diminish and individual plots appear to be much flatter, once again approaching a linear behavior for sufficiently higher value of α. The general qualitative features remain same for other states as well.

Finally Fig. 3 shows energy eigenvalues (in a.u.) with respect to the parameter D_e. First in the left panel (a), 2p–8p state energies are depicted for a sufficiently large range of D_e, keeping both α, σ_0 constant at 0.1. For low-n states, energy increases steadily in the beginning at smaller D_e, which is eventually arrested after some time, with a consequent slow down of further increase. As n assumes higher values, the rate of increase tends to remain unhindered resulting very much a straight-line like shape. Now the middle panel (b) shows similar plots for a representative 2p state for seven α values of 0.1, 0.2, $\cdots$, 0.7 (covering short and long range), keeping $\sigma_0 = 0.1$, in all cases. Same observation as in (a)



FIG. 2: Energy eigenvalues (a.u.) of hyperbolic potential as function of σ_0 for (a) np ($n = 2 - 7$) states, having $D_e = 10, \alpha = 0.1$, (b) 2p state for fixed $D_e = 10$, $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2, \cdots, 0.7$.

holds true; as α goes to higher values, the individual plots lead to higher energy values and also tend to become more like straight line. Also the separation between two neighboring α plots becomes smaller and smaller as the latter increases. Then in the right panel (c), we give the E versus D_e plots, again for a selected state (2p) for seven σ_0 values, namely, 0.1, 0,2, $\cdots$, 0.7, having a constant $\alpha = 0.1$. Note that the energy axis in (c) is different from (a), (b). In this case, for higher σ_0, energies go to lower values, and much like in (a), (b), the separation between two adjacent σ_0 plots is reduced. Very recently, energy variation with D_e for $1s, 2s, 2p, 3s$ states of this potential has been studied (for fixed $\sigma_0 = 0.2$) in [16] by means of asymptotic iteration method, which seems to corroborate our present findings.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the present communication, we have provided accurate solutions of the Schrödinger equation with a hyperbolic potential. Non-relativistic eigenvalues are obtained easily by means of a generalized pseudospectral method, giving an optimal radial discretization. The validity and feasibility of this is demonstrated by producing very good-quality ro-vibrational energies for arbitrary n, ℓ quantum numbers. Energies accurate up to ten to eleven significant figures are reported here for the first time, which compares quite excellently with the existing literature data. Special emphasis has been given to higher states as well in the long range of



FIG. 3: Energy eigenvalues (a.u.) of hyperbolic potential as function of D_e, for (a) np ($n = 2 - 8$) states, having $\sigma_0 = \alpha = 0.1$, (b) 2p state with $\sigma_0 = 0.1$, $\alpha = 0.1, 0.2, \cdots, 0.7$, and (c) 2p state with $\alpha = 0.1$ and $\sigma_0 = 0.1, 0.2, \cdots, 0.7$ respectively.

the potential. A detailed investigation on the variation of energy with respect to potential parameters has been made for the first time. Many new states are reported. In essence, an accurate and reliable scheme for solution of this and similar potential is presented.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It is a pleasure to thank Mr. Shahid Ali Farooqui of the Computer Center for his help on making the plots. I am grateful to the Director, Prof. R. N. Mukherjee, for his constant support and encouragement. Sincerely thank goes to the anonymous referee for his kind, constructive and valuable comments, from which the manuscript has greatly benefited.

---

[1] P. G. Hajigeorgiou and R. J. Le Roy, A "modified Lennard-Jones oscillator" model for diatom potential functions. J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 3949 (2000).

[2] A. A. Zavitsas, The potential energy curve of the ground sates of lithium, $X^1\Sigma_g^+$. J. Mol. Spectrosc. **221**, 67 (2003).

[3] A. A. Zavitsas, Comparison of the relative accuracy of the potential energy curve of hydrogen fluoride from ab initio calculations and from an empirical "universal" function. J. Mol. Spectrosc. **236**, 168 (2006).

[4] J. A. Coxon and T. C. Melville, Application of direct potential fitting to line position data for the $X^1\Sigma_g^+$ and $A^1\Sigma_u^+$ states of Li_2. J. Mol. Spectrosc. **235** 235 (2006).

[5] A. Shayesteh, R. D. E. Heenderson, R. J. Le Roy and P. F. Bernath, Ground state potential energy curve and dissociation energy of MgH. J. Phys. Chem. A **111**, 12495 (2007).

[6] J. A. Coxon and P. G. Hajigeorgiou, The ground $X^1\Sigma_g^+$ electronic state of the cesium dimer: Application of a direct potential fitting procedure. J. Chem. Phys. **132**, 094105 (2010).

[7] N. S. Dattani and R. J. Le Roy, A DPF data analysis yields accurate analytic potentials for Li_2 $(a^3\Sigma_u^+)$ and Li_2 $(1^3\Sigma_g^+)$ that incorporate 3-state mixing near the $1^3\Sigma_g^+$ state asymptote. J. Mol. Spectrosc. **268**, 199 (2011).

[8] D. Schiöberg, The energy eigenvalues of hyperbolic potential functions. Mol. Phys. **59**, 1123 (1986).

[9] J. Lu, Analytic quantum mechanics of diatomic molecules with empirical potentials. Phys. Scr. **72**, 349 (2005).

[10] S. Dong, J. García-Ravelo and S.-H. Dong, Analytical approximations to the $\ell-$wave solutions of the Schrödinger equation with an exponential-type potential. Phys. Scr. **76**, 393 (2007).

[11] S. Dong, S. G. Miranda, F. M. Enriquez and S.-H. Dong, Analytical approximations to the $\ell-$wave solutions of the Shcrödinger equation with a hyperbolic potential. Mod. Phys. Lett. B **22**, 483 (2008).

[12] S. M. Ikhdair and R. Sever, Improved analytical approximation to arbitrary $\ell-$state solutions of the Schrd̈inger equation for the hyperbolical potential. Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **18**, 189 (2009).

[13] S. M. Ikhdair and R. Sever, Improved analytical approximation to arbitrary $\ell-$state solutions of the Schrödinger equation for the hyperbolical potentials. Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **18**, 747 (2009).

[14] C. Berkdemir, Ro-vibrating energy states of a diatomic molecule in an empirical potential. J. Math. Chem. **46**, 492 (2009).

[15] B. J. Falaye, Arbitrary $\ell-$state solutions of the hyperbolical potential by the asymptotic iteration method. Few-Body Syst. **53**, 557 (2012).

[16] S. Ortakaya, Nonrelativistic $\ell-$state solutions for Schiöberg molecular potential in hyperspherical coordinates. Few-Body Syst. **54**, 1901 (2013).

[17] C.-S. Jia, J.-Y. Liu, L. He and L.-T. Sun, Pseudospin symmetry in the relativistic empirical potential as a diatomic molecular model. Phys. Scr. **75**, 388 (2007).

[18] P.-Q. Wang, L.-H. Zhang, C.-S. Jia and J.-Y. Liu, Equivalence of the three empirical potential energy models for diatomic molecules. J. Mol. Spect. **274**, 5 (2012).

[19] A. K. Roy, Studies on some singular potentials in quantum mechanics.

Int. J. Quant. Chem. **104**, 861 (2005).

[20] A. K. Roy, The generalized pseudospectral approach to the bound states of the Hulthén and the Yukawa potentials. Pramana–J. Phys. **65**, 01 (2005).

[21] K. D. Sen and A. K. Roy, Studies on the 3D confined potentials using generalized pseudospectral approach. Phys. Lett. A **357**, 112 (2006).

[22] A. K. Roy and A. F. Jalbout, Ground and excited states of Li^-, Be^- through a density-based approach. Chem. Phys. Lett. **445**, 355 (2007).

[23] A. K. Roy, A. F. Jalbout and E. I. Proynov, Bound state spectra of the 3D rational potential. Int. J. Quant. Chem. **108**, 827 (2008).

[24] A. K. Roy, A. F. Jalbout and E. I. Proynov, Accurate calculation of the bound states of Hellmann potential. J. Math. Chem. **44**, 260 (2008).

[25] A. K. Roy and A. F. Jalbout, Bound states of the generalized spiked harmonic oscillator. J. Mol. Struct: Theochem **853**, 27 (2008).

[26] A. K. Roy, Studies in some exponential-screened Coulomb potentials. Int. J. Quant. Chem. **113**, 1503 (2013).

[27] I. Nasser, M. S. Abdelmonem and A. Abdel-Hady, The Manning-Rosen potential using J-matrix approach. Mol. Phys. **111**, 1 (2013).

[28] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Solving the Schrödinger equation for bound states with MATHEMATICA 3.0. Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **10**, 607 (1999).


8
6
4
2
0
Energy
0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1
1.2
α
6s
3s
2s
1s
(a)


Energy
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6


6s
3s
2s
1s
(b)
Energy
α
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
0
0.4
0.8
1.2
1.6


(a)
Energy
10
8
6
4
2
0
0
0.4
0.8
1.2
1.6
2
σ0
1s
2s
3s
4s
5s
6s


7p
(d)
4p
3p
2p
Energy
α
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8